

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14, 16-19, 22-27, 29, 30, 33, 45, and 47 been amended and claims 43-44 have been cancelled. New claim 48 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-42 and 45-47 remain pending.

The Examiner's noting of the allowable subject matter of claims 7, 8, 10-13, 20, 22-25, 36, 37, and 39-42 is appreciated.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9, 14-19, 21, 26-35, 38, and 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) being unpatentable over Stanwood (US 6,731,946) in view of Gurne (US 5,541,840). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed as follows.

Claim 1 is directed towards a "method for managing a first component of a wireless network using a second component of the wireless network." Claim 1 also recites "when a configuration recovery mode is selected manually via a physical interface of the second component without accessing a network interface of the second component, sending a configuration signal from the second component to the first component, wherein the configuration signal specifies that the first component is to perform a reconfiguration." Independent claim 14 recites "when an image recovery mode is selected manually via a physical interface of the second component..." Independent claim 16 is directed towards an apparatus that includes "a physical interface" and "at least one of the processors or memory [that is] adapted for when a configuration recovery mode is selected manually via the physical interface of the first apparatus without accessing a network interface of the first apparatus, sending a configuration signal from the first apparatus to the second apparatus, wherein the configuration signal specifies that the second apparatus is to perform a reconfiguration." Independent claim 30 requires "computer program instructions...configured for when a configuration recovery mode is selected manually via a physical interface of the second component without accessing a network interface, sending an image recovery signal from the second component to the first component." Independent claim 45 requires "computer program instructions configured for... when an image recovery mode is selected manually via a physical interface of the second component without accessing a network interface, sending an image recovery signal from the second component to the first component" Independent claim 47 recites means for "when a configuration recovery mode is selected manually via a physical interface of the second component without accessing a network interface of the second component, sending a configuration signal from the second component to the first component." Independent claim 48 requires means for "means for sending an image recovery signal from the second component to the first component when an image recovery mode is selected manually via a physical interface of the second component without accessing a network interface of the second component."

Embodiments of the present invention allow one to initiate, from a first wireless component's physical interface without accessing the network interface of such first component, a configuration or image recovery in another wireless component, such as an outdoor unit or ODU, even when network communication with the ODU is not functioning properly.

The primary reference Stanwood recites a conventional automated system for controlling aspects of an ODU via an IDU (indoor unit). Specifically, Stanwood teaches resetting an ODU at Col. 8, Lines 37-43 and controlling the ODU at Col. 9, Lines 31-57 and Col. 11, Lines 36-40 via an IDU. As noted by the Examiner, Stanwood teaches only automated control. Specifically, Stanwood teaches controlling the ODU through a network interface, e.g., backhaul interface 124 of Figure 1. Additionally, Stanwood teaches a number of different types of data control messages that are used to control the ODU. See for example, Tables 12 and 14 on Col. 17. This type of automated control is in contrast to utilizing a physical interface of the IDU to manually select a configuration or image recovery mode for the ODU. In sum, Stanwood fails to teach or suggest initiating a recovery mode on a wireless device by manually selecting such mode via a physical interface of another wireless device and without accessing the network interface of such other wireless device (or mechanisms for performing the same), in the manner claimed.

The secondary reference Gurne is used in the current rejection as teaching a manual recovery mechanism. However, Gurne is directed towards an automotive control application, rather than towards initiating a recovery mode for a component of a wireless network. It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art of wireless networks would likely be unaware of a reference in the automotive field, and, accordingly, not be motivated to combine the teaching of non-analogous automotive field of Gurne with the wireless network teachings of Stanwood. Additionally, the goal of Gurne is to diagnose and isolate problems within an automobile, rather than to perform a recovery process. See Abstract. Finally, the components of the automobile are not wireless components. It is respectfully submitted that the Gurne reference is in a vastly different field than wireless networks and one would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Gurne with the teachings of Stanwood. Gurne also fails to teach or suggest initiating a recovery mode on a wireless device by manually selecting such mode via a physical interface of another wireless device and without accessing the network interface of such other wireless device (or mechanisms for performing the same), in the manner claimed.

For the forgoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 14, 16, 30, 45, 47, and 48 are patentable over the cited art. The Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims are also respectfully traversed. However, to expedite prosecution, all of these claims will not be argued separately. Claims 2-13, 15, 17-29, 31-44, and 46 each depend directly or indirectly from

independent claims 1, 14, 16, 30, or 45 and, therefore, are respectfully submitted to be patentable over cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 14, 16, 30, or 45. Further, the dependent claims require additional elements that when considered in context of the claimed inventions further patentably distinguish the invention from the cited art. The cited references fail to teach or suggest such limitations.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

/Mary R. Olynick/
Mary R. Olynick
Reg. 42,963

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100